

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 have been canceled. Claim 3 has been amended so that it is directed to elected Species B and to incorporate recitations from claim 10. Claims 4 and 5 have been canceled. Claim 6 has been amended to depend on claim 3 in view of the cancellation of claim 1. Claims 7-10 have been canceled. Claims 11 and 12 have been amended to depend on claim 3 in view of the cancellation of claim 1. Claims 13 and 14 have been added based on the disclosure in the paragraph bridging pages 17-18 and the disclosure in the Examples.

Entry of the above amendment is respectfully requested.

Anticipation Rejection over Wyatt et al

On page 2 of the Office Action, in paragraph 4, claims 1-3 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wyatt et al. (US Patent 6,162,593).

In response, Applicants note that claims 1 and 2 have been canceled, and claim 3 has been amended to include recitations of claim 10, which has not been included in this rejection, so the rejection of claim 3 has been overcome. Claims 11 and 12 have been amended to depend from claim 3, so the rejection of claims 11 and 12 has been overcome as well.

Also, it is noted that claim 13 has been added reciting two or more of propylene glycol monomethyl ether, propylene glycol monomethyl ether acetate, butyl acetate, ethyl 3-ethoxypropionate, methyl 3-methoxypropionate, and cyclohexanone. In this regard, it is submitted that Table 1 on page 24 in the specification shows that good results are obtained with invention embodiments containing a first component and two solvents as the third component, and it is submitted that Wyatt does not teach or suggest the use of two or more of propylene

glycol monomethyl ether, propylene glycol monomethyl ether acetate, butyl acetate, ethyl 3-ethoxypropionate, methyl 3-methoxypropionate, and cyclohexanone.

Thus, Applicants submit that the present invention is not anticipated by (or obvious over) Wyatt et al, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Anticipation Rejection over Blum et al

On page 3 of the Office Action, in paragraph 5, claims 1-4 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Blum et al. (US Patent 5,350,663).

In response, Applicants submit that the composition in Example 3 of Blum et al. does not correspond to Species B. Therefore, Applicants submit that this rejection has been overcome by amending claim 3 so that it is directed to Species B. Also, it is noted that claim 3 has been amended to include recitations of claim 10, which has not been included in this rejection. In addition, it is submitted that Blum does not teach or suggest the requirements of new independent claim 13, including the use of two or more of propylene glycol monomethyl ether, propylene glycol monomethyl ether acetate, butyl acetate, ethyl 3-ethoxypropionate, methyl 3-methoxypropionate, and cyclohexanone.

Thus, Applicants submit that the present invention is not anticipated by (or obvious over) Blum et al, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Anticipation Rejection over Sato et al

On page 4 of the Office Action, in paragraph 6, claims 1-2 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sato et al. (US Patent 5,185,235)

In response, Applicants note initially that Sato et al. relate to a remover solution for photoresist, which comprises (A) an alcoholic solvent, (B) an organic solvent selected from the group consisting of halogenated hydrocarbon solvents, ether solvents and unhalogenated aromatic solvents, and (C) a quaternary ammonium salt dissolved in a solvent mixture composed of the components (A) and (B) (column 2, lines 8-24).

However, Applicants submit that this composition is different from the Species B remover having a composition of 10 to 20 percent by mass of one or more aromatic hydrocarbon(s) and 80 to 90 percent by mass of one or more other solvent(s) other than aprotic polar solvents.

Therefore, Applicants submit that this rejection has been overcome by canceling claims 1 and 2 and by amending claims 11 and 12 to depend on claim 3, which itself has been amended to be directed to Species B.

In addition, it is submitted that Sato does not teach or suggest the requirements of new independent claim 13, including the use of two or more of propylene glycol monomethyl ether, propylene glycol monomethyl ether acetate, butyl acetate, ethyl 3-ethoxypropionate, methyl 3-methoxypropionate, and cyclohexanone.

Finally, Applicants submit that the remover of Sato et al. comprises a quaternary ammonium salt as an indispensable component, while new claim 14 recites that the remover consists of solvents, and thus it does not include a quaternary ammonium salt. Therefore, claim 14 distinguishes over the Sato et al. invention for this additional reason.

Thus, Applicants submit that the present invention is not anticipated by (or obvious over) Sato et al., and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection over Sato et al in view Nishioka et al

On page 5 of the Office Action, in paragraph 8, claims 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. (US Patent 5,185,235) in view of Nishioka et al. (US Patent 4,845,008).

In response, Applicants note initially that remover solutions No. 18-20, 27 and 28 exemplified in Sato et al. all comprise 40 percent by weight of an aromatic hydrocarbon. The aromatic hydrocarbon content of 40 percent by weight falls outside of the scope of claim 3 (into which recitations of claim 10 have been incorporated) and claim 6 (which depends on claim 3). In other words, Applicants submit that Sato et al. does not suggest that aromatic hydrocarbon in the content range prescribed by the present invention exhibits effective removing performance.

Applicants submit that the Nishioka et al. invention relates to a light-sensitive composition suitable for a PS plate, characterized by comprising mixed solvents consisting of three organic solvents having different boiling points (column 2, lines 10-53). The mixed solvents are used as solvents for dissolving a light-sensitive resin component, but not as a photosensitive composition remover. In the Office Action, the Examiner pointed out Example 5 in Table 1 of Nishioka et al. The mixed solvents used in Example 5 consist of 55% of propylene glycol monomethyl ether, 35% of methyl ethyl ketone and 10% ethylene glycol monomethyl ether acetate. Even if these mixed solvents are combined with the remover solution of Sato et al., the combination suggests only a remover comprising 40 percent by mass of aromatic hydrocarbon (which is different from a remover of the present invention as recited in independent claim 3) and, furthermore, results in a remover comprising a quaternary ammonium

salt as an indispensable component (which is different from a remover of the present invention as recited in claim 14).

In addition, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined Sato with Nishioka, contrary to the Examiner's assertion. In this regard, it is noted that Sato is directed to a remover solution for a photoresist composition, while Nishioka is directed to a light-sensitive composition itself. It is submitted that there is no reason why one would have applied a solvent used in formulating a light sensitive composition (i.e., the solvent of Nishioka) to a solution used to remove a photoresist. Therefore, the present claims would not have been obvious because one would not have even combined the cited references.

Thus, the present invention is not obvious over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Bruce E. Kramer/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Bruce E. Kramer
Registration No. 33,725

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 1, 2008